



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,000	07/25/2003	John Jason Auvenshine	TU999060US2	3960
46917	7590	10/05/2007	EXAMINER	
KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP. ATTN: IBM37 315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210 BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212			SALAD, ABDULLAHI ELM	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2157				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/05/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/628,000	AUVENTSHINE, JOHN JASON	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Salad E. Abdullahi	2157		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/25/2003.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been reviewed. Original claims 1-37 are pending. The rejection cited stated below.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Initially it should be noted that the present application have the same inventive entity of U.S. Patent No. 6,633,855. The Assignee in both applications is the same.

4. Claims 1-37 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-42 of U.S. Patent No. 6,633,855. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because a comparison between instant application independent claims 1, 16 and 23 and independent claims 1, 15 and 29 of the patented claims reveal the claims are not patentable distinct from each other. Every element of claims 1-37 of the instant application are anticipated by the patented claims. Claims of the instant application therefore are not patentably distinct from the earlier patent claims and as such are unpatentable over obvious-type double patenting. A later patent/application claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier claim if the later claim is anticipated by the earlier claim.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayyadurai U.S. Patent No. 6,718,367[hereinafter Ayyadurai] in view of Russell-Falla et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,675,162 [hereinafter Russell-Falla]

As per claim 1, Ayyadurai discloses a method for filtering communications received from over a network for a person-to-person communication program, comprising: receiving a communication for the person-to person communication program (email program (see fig. 2 and col. 5, lines 24-40);

Processing (extracting) the communication to determine predefined language statements (see fig. And co. 5, lines 9-40).

determining whether the output value indicates that the communication is unacceptable (see col. 5, line 60 to col. 7, line 32);

forwarding the communication to the person-to-person communication program unchanged if the output value indicates that the communication is acceptable(see col. 5, line 60 to col. 7, line 32);and

performing an action with respect to the communication upon determining that the communication is unacceptable that differs from the forwarding of the communication

that occurs if the output value indicates that the communication is acceptable (see col. 5, line 60 to col. 7, line 32);

Ayyadurai is silent regarding: inputting information on the determined language statements into a neural network to produce an output value.

Russell-Fall discloses a method for scanning, analyzing and handling various kinds of digital information content including inputting information on the determined language statements into a neural network to produce an output value (see figs 2 and 3 and col. 6, line 35 to col. 7, line 24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention presented with teaching of Ayyadurai to incorporate the scanning, analyzing and handling various kinds of digital information content including inputting information on the determined language statements into a neural network to produce an output value as taught by Russell-Fall to efficiently and accurately identify instances of particular language content within a real-time data stream.

As per claims 2-15, Russell-Fall discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the person-to-person communication program is intended for use in a work environment, and wherein determining predefined language statements comprises determining non-work related terms that are often searched for by employees (col. 6, line 35 to col. 7, line 24).

As per claims 16-37, the claims features similar with features in claims 1-15, thus claims 16-37 are rejected same rational as claims –15.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Salad E Abdullahi whose telephone number is 571-272-4009. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-4009**.
8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abdullahi Salad
9/30/2007


ABDULLAHI SALAD
PRIMARY EXAMINER